

APR. 12. 2007 3:51PM

HARRINGTON & SMITH

NO. 216 P. 1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 12 2007

*enter*  
*Arndt/RCE*  
*5-1-07*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/539,914

Confirmation No.: 6534

Applicant(s): Droesbeke

Filed: 11/14/2005

Art Unit: 2831

Examiner: Ngo, Hung V.

Title: Shielding Cage

Attorney Docket No.: 003D.0068.U1(US)

Customer No.: 29,683

Commissioner For Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response To Office Action

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 01/18/2007 in regard to the above-identified patent application.

Claims 15-21, 25-32 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Benzoni (US 5,416,668). Claims 22-24 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Benzoni (US 5,416,668). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

The examiner stated that the limitation of "die case" does not result in a structural difference. This is incorrect. The examiner is directed to MPEP 2113. As stated in this section of the MPEP,

"The structure implied by the process steps should be considered when assessing the patentability of product-by-process claims over the prior art, especially where

*Do not*  
*enter*  
*4-26-07*  
*HVN*